FY 2014 St. Louis County CoC
Review & Ranking Committee Policies & Procedures:

Eligible proposals will be prioritized for inclusion in CoC's coordinated application by the Review & Ranking Committee.

Goals for each application cycle will be based on HUD's FY 2013/2014 application evaluation criteria, in order to maximize competitiveness of the Continuum's application within the larger National CoC competition.

The scoring tools **(see Exhibit 1)** used by the Review & Ranking Committee was developed using HUD guidelines and best practices for performance ranking and were approved approved by the Leadership Council for the 2013 CoC Review and Ranking process of the CoC. The Review & Ranking committee will use the scoring tool to assess the performance of the 2014 new and renewal projects based on the following performance measures:

- • HUD monitoring findings
- • HUD APRs for performance results
- . CoC monitoring findings
- • Unexecuted grants
- • Project readiness
- • Timely Expenditure of grant funds
- • Applicant experience
- • Applicant-organization capacity
- • CoC membership involvement
- • HMIS participation involvement and participation
- • Match funds committed to project
- • Leverage funds committed to project
- • Ratio of requested housing funds
- • Other priorities, to be determined by the CoC (based on NOFA priorities)
- • Leadership Council (board) priorities

The CoC recruits Review & Ranking Committee members who are knowledgeable about homelessness and housing in the area and who are broadly representative of the relevant

sectors, subpopulations, and geographic areas. The Review & Ranking Committee will be composed of representatives from a cross-section of groups which might include: Faith-based and non-profit providers of homeless services and housing; housing developers; City of Duluth representatives; St. Louis County; mental health; substance abuse; veteran's services; and consumers.

• The Review & Ranking committee shall include a minimum of two (2) persons who participated in the previous year's Review & Ranking process.

- Review & Ranking Committee members shall sign a statement declaring that they have no conflict of interest and a confidentiality agreement

• Members must be appointed every year, their eligibility verified, and approved by the Executive Committee

• Members must be able to dedicate time for application review and committee meetings as directed by the Executive Committee or their designee

• Review & Ranking Committee members shall include persons experienced in the CoC process and are able to review and analyze information relevant to ranking CoC projects, including:

o Information regarding homeless activities, needs, services, definitions and other issues that are pertinent to the St. Louis County Homeless Response system.

o A background of the McKinney Vento Act

o The roles and responsibilities of the Review & Ranking Committee

o Review of the scoring tools, applications, and resources

• Review & Ranking Committee shall establish a time frame that allows for review and discussion about the applications, questions and clarification about applications with applicant agencies, scoring of the applications, and presenting project scoring and ranking recommendations, with discussion, to the Leadership Council.

o The Review & Ranking Committee meeting includes a teleconference as needed with each project applicant.

o Overall raw scores (Objective APR & Project application data)are calculated by St. Louis County staff, doubled checked by certified accountant staff.

o The Committee considers adjustments for such issues HUD incentives or priority requirements

o The Committee considers proposal changes or project budget adjustments that may be required to meet community needs

o The Committee determines the rank and funding levels of all projects considering all available information

o During deliberation, St. Louis County staff will provide technical assistance by responding to questions of the Panelists, correcting technical inaccuracies if they arise in conversation, and reminding the Panelists of their responsibilities if they step outside their purview

- o Scoring results are delivered to applicants with a reminder about the Appeal process if a project application is rejected.

o Applications which do not meet the threshold requirements will not be included in the Priority List in the CoC Application, and therefore will not be forwarded to HUD for consideration

o If more applications are submitted than the CoC has money to fund, the lowest-scoring applications will not be included in the Priority List in the CoC Application, and therefore will not be forwarded to HUD for consideration

Appeals

• The application of any applicant agency which a) is unranked, or b) receives less funding than they applied for may appeal

• Applicants that have been found not to meet the threshold requirements are not eligible for an appeal

• Appeals cannot be based upon the judgment of the Review & Ranking Committee

Applicants may appeal if they can:

• Prove their score is not reflective of the application information provided; or

• Describe bias or unfairness in the process, which warrants the appeal

All notices of appeal must be based on the information submitted by the application due date. No new or additional information will be considered. Omissions to the application cannot be appealed.

The decision of the Appeal Committee will be final.

The Appeal Committee

• The Appeal Committee will be made up of three (3) voting members of the Leadership Council

• Two members will not have participated on the original Rating & Ranking Committee

• One committee member must be a member of the original Review & Ranking Committee

• No member of the Appeal Committee may have a conflict of interest with any of the agencies applying for McKinney funding and must sign a conflict of interest statement

• The role of the Appeal Committee is to read and review only those areas of the application that are being appealed

The Appeal Process

• Any and all appeals must be received in writing within one (1) business day of the notification of ranking to projects. Due date is October 16, 2014 by 4:30. The written appeal can be scanned & e-mailed to the CoC Coordinator: Laura DeRosier – derosierl@stlouiscountymn.gov

• The notice of appeal must include a written statement specifying in detail the grounds asserted for the appeal, must be signed by an individual authorized to represent the sponsor agency (i.e., Executive Director)

• The notice of appeal is limited to one single spaced page in 12-point font

• The appeal must include a copy of the application and all accompanying materials submitted to the Review & Ranking Committee; no additional information can be submitted

• All valid appeals will be read, reviewed and evaluated by the Appeal Committee

• The Appeal Committee will meet to deliberate based on the following:

> o Applicants will be invited to make a 10-minute statement regarding the appeal

> o The panel will review the rankings made by the Review & Ranking Committee only on the basis of the submitted project application, the one page appeal, any statements made during the appeal process, and the material used by the Review & Ranking Committee; no new information can be submitted by the applicant or reviewed by the Appeal Committee

> o The decision of the appellate panel must be supported by a simple majority vote

• The decision of the Appeal Committee will be final

Review & Ranking Committee Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Statement

Definition of Conflict of Interest

No person with a "conflict of interest" may serve on the Rating & Ranking Committee.

A conflict of interest exists if:

> 1) You are now, or within the last year have been, or have a current agreement to serve in the future as, a Board member, staff member or paid consultant of an organization making a proposal for funding; or

> 2) Your employer or an organization on whose Board of Directors you sit, now has, or within the last year has had, a contractual relationship with an organization making a proposal for funding. However, under this second definition of "conflict of interest," no conflict exists if your employer, or the organization on whose Board of Directors you sit, is a funding entity or organization whose mission includes providing services and/or funding to other service providers; or

> 3) Any other circumstance exists which impedes your ability to objectively, fairly and impartially review and rank the proposals for funding.

Confidentiality

In addition to avoiding Conflicts of Interest, the Rating &Ranking Committee should maintain confidentiality surrounding the rating and ranking process. To demonstrate respect for the organizations being considered, Rating & Ranking Committee discussions and information about specific applications should be kept confidential.

Acknowledgement

I have read and understand the definition of "Conflict of Interest." No conflict of interest prohibits me from serving on the Rating & Ranking Committee. Should I later become aware of a conflict of interest, I immediately will resign from the Rating & Ranking Committee.

_____

_____

Signature Date

Exhibit 1

2013 NOFA: St. Louis County Qualifying Requirements (1/2/2014)

**Provider and Project
Name:_____**

THRESHOLD CRITERIA: Renewal Source: Application/Exhibit 2 and Attachments, Letter of Intent			Check One	
Criteria	Eligible	Ineligible	Yes	No
Eligible entity	Eligible project applicants for the CoC Program Competition are nonprofit organizations, States, local governments, and instrumentalities of State and local governments, and public housing agencies, as such term is defined in 24 CFR 5.100, without limitation or exclusion.	Entity is not a nonprofit organization, state or local government, or instrumentality of a state and local government, or public housing agencies, as such term is defined in 24CFR5.100, without limitation of exclusion. For-profit entities are not eligible to apply for grants or to be sub-recipients of grant funds.		
*Submission Deadline	Project application is submitted to CoC coordinator by 1/2/2014 by 4:30 p.m.	Project application is submitted to SLC CoC coordinator later than 1/2/2014 by 4:30 p.m.		
HMIS and Coordinated Assessment	Project has the capacity and an acceptable plan to participate fully in HMIS and the CoC's Coordinated Assessment (CA)	Project does not have the capacity nor an acceptable plan to participate fully in HMIS and the CoC's Coordinated Assessment (CA)		
Match	The project, with the exception of Leasing, has match 25% or more that is sufficiently documented to meet HUD expectations	The project either does not have match of up to 25% or does not have match documentation sufficient to meet HUD expectations		
Administrative Costs	Administrative costs equal to or less than 7% of total project budget	Administrative costs more than 7% of project costs.		
Renewal Project is Eligible				
Additional Requirement for New Projects – Source: Letter of Intent				

Organizational Capacity	• Organization has bylaws that govern operations • Organization has an active governing Board of Directors that includes at least one member who is homeless or formerly homeless (or plan to recruit someone)	• Organization does not have a mission/purpose statement and bylaws that govern operations • Organization does not have an active governing Board of Directors that includes at least one member who is homeless or formerly homeless (or plan to recruit someone)	—	
	New Project is Eligible			

  *Exceptions to this requirement will only be made to projects that have faced dire circumstances and have sought and gained permission from Laura DeRosier to submit late.

2013 NOFA Project Scoring
Appendix A: RENEWAL PROJECT
Type of Housing: PHS   TH   SSO
Total Awarded Score = _____Points

Priority Populations: Total Possible Points 12 Total Awarded Points: _____
Sources: Letter of Intent, Project Application, Email Communication on Housing First

Criterion	Most Desirable	Desirable	Least Desirable
Chronically homeless households (3/1/-1)	75% or more of CoC-funded units or services are prioritized for and/or serve chronically homeless households	1-74% of CoC-funded units or services are prioritized for and/or serve chronically homeless households	None of CoC-funded units or services are prioritized for and/or serve chronically homeless households
Homeless Households with Children (2/1/0)	75% or more of CoC-funded units or services are for homeless households with children	50% to 74% of CoC-funded units or services are for homeless households with children	0% to 49% of CoC-funded units or services are for homeless households with children
K-12 education for programs serving children (1/0)	Meets HUD requirement: written plan and staff in place to ensure children & youth enrolled in and attending school and connected to services to support their educational needs per McKinney Vento Education law		For projects that serve families with children. Projects do not connect children to their educational needs.
Veterans (2/1/0)	75% or more of CoC-funded units or services are for Veterans	50% to 74% of CoC-funded units or services are for Veterans	0% to 49% of CoC-funded units or services are for Veterans
Homeless Youth	75% or more of CoC-funded units or	50% to 74% of CoC-	0% to 49% of CoC-

(2/1/0)	services are for homeless youth	funded units or services are for homeless youth	funded units or services are for homeless youth
Housing First (2/0)	Project meets housing first definition identified by HUD		Project does not meet the housing first definition identified by HUD

Project Administration: Total Possible Points 4 Total Points Awarded: _____
Sources: Letter of Intent, Project Application/Exhibit 2 with Attachments, Budget with Attachments, HMIS Report, HUD Report, HIC

Leverage (1/0/-1)	The project is able to document leverage at or above 150%	The project is able to document leverage between 140 to 150%	The project leverages between 0-139%
HMIS data quality Based on MN HMIS minimal targets and goals (1/0/-1)	Projects report 98% or more completed values for the Universal Data Elements	Projects report 92-97% completed values for the Universal Data Elements	Projects reports 91% or less completed values for the Universal Data Elements
Funding Management: Drawdown funds (1/0/-1)	Drawdowns occur on a monthly basis	Drawdowns occur at least quarterly	Drawdowns occur less than quarterly
Bed Utilization No HUD Stds; based on HIC (1/0/-1)	Projects report average daily bed utilization rates at or above 90% of beds	Projects report average daily bed utilization rates at or above 75 - 89% of beds	Projects report average daily bed utilization rates below 74% of beds

Income Growth: Total Possible Points 7 Total Awarded Points: ____
Sources: APR and CoC Performance Reports, Letter of Intent

Employment Income at Exit (2/1/-1)	21% or more	20%	0-19%
Unearned Income (Leavers & Stayer) (2/1/-1)	Projects report that at over 54% of program participants receive cash income other than employment	Projects report that at least 25-53% of program participants receive cash income other than employment	Projects report less than 24% of program participants receive cash income other than employment
Mainstream Benefits (Leavers and Stayers) (3/1/-1)	Projects report that over 56% of program participants receive mainstream benefits	25-55% of program participants receive mainstream benefits	Less than 24% of program participants receive mainstream

Housing Stability: Sources: APR and CoC Performance Reports, Letter of Intent

Permanent Housing Only: Total Possible Points 6   Total Awarded Points: ____

Housing Stability (3/1/0)	81% or more	80%	79% or less
Exits to permanent destinations (3/0/-1)	75% or more	60-74%	59% or less
Transitional Housing Only: Total Possible Points 3 Total Awarded Points: ____			
Exits to permanent housing (3/1/-1)	82% or more	71-81%	0-70%
Support Services Only: Total Possible Points 2 Total Awarded Points: ____			
Destination at exit (2/0)	50% or more already in or moving to permanent housing		0-49% already in or moving to permanent housing

Potential Renewal Bonus Points: Total Bonus Points: 3 Awarded Bonus Points: _____ **Sources: CoC Performance Reports, Application, Letter of Intent**			
Possible Points	Criteria	Yes	No
2 points	Project will provide rapid-rehousing for families		
1 points	Exceeded 175% leverage		

2013 NOFA Project Scoring
Appendix B: NEW PROJECT
Type of Housing: PSH   TH   SSO
Total Awarded Score = ____Points

Priority Populations: Total Possible Points 11 Total Awarded Points: _____ **Sources: Letter of Intent, Project Application**			
Criterion	Most Desirable	Desirable	Least Desirable
Chronically homeless households (3/1/-1)	75% or more of CoC-funded units or services are prioritized to serve chronically homeless households	1-74% of CoC-funded units or services are prioritized to serve chronically homeless households	None of CoC-funded units or services are prioritized to serve chronically homeless households
Homeless Households with Children (2/1/0)	75% or more of CoC-funded units or services are for homeless households with children	50% to 74% of CoC-funded units or services are for homeless households with children	0% to 49% of CoC-funded units or services are for homeless households with children

Veterans (2/1/0)	75% or more of CoC-funded units or services are for Veterans	50% to 74% of CoC-funded units or services are for Veterans	0% to 49% of CoC-funded units or services are for Veterans
Homeless Youth (2/1/0)	75% or more of CoC-funded units or services are for homeless youth	50% to 74% of CoC-funded units or services are for homeless youth	0% to 49% of CoC-funded units or services are for homeless youth
Housing First (2/0)	Project meets housing first definition identified by HUD		Project does not meet the housing first definition identified by HUD
Project Narrative: Total Possible Points 7 Total Awarded Points: **Sources: Project Application**			
Documents Need for Project (2/1/-1)	Narrative clearly documents need for project and uses relevant data in support	Narrative documents but does not use supportive data	Need is not documented
Experience with proposed activities (2/1/-1)	Demonstrates relevant experience with proposed target population and services	Limited experience with proposed services or with a different population	Insufficient of no experience in providing housing or services
Referral process and services are appropriate for type of service proposed (1/0)	Referral process and services are appropriate for the type of service provided.		Referral process and services are not appropriate for the type of service provided.
Program design identifies use of Best Practices or uniqueness (1/0)	Project narrative clearly identifies best practices or uniqueness.		Project narrative does not appear to include best practices or uniqueness.
Housing to Services Ratio (1/1/0)	75-100% housing request	65-74% housing request	Less than 65% housing request
Project Budget and Fiscal Information: Total Possible Points 2 Total Points Awarded: _____ **Sources: Project Application/Exhibit 2, Budget and Attachments**			
Criterion	**Most Desirable**	**Desirable**	**Least Desirable**
Budget is accurate and complete (2/0)	Budget submitted was accurate and complete		Budget submitted was inaccurate and/or incomplete
Projected Outcomes: Total Possible Points 8 Total Points Awarded: _____ **Sources: Project Application**			

Describes how services will support achieving program outcomes (8/5/0)	Project narrative clearly articulates how services will support achieving program outcomes	Project narrative identifies services and outcomes but link is not clear on how services will support achieving outcomes.	Project narrative does not make any attempt to link how services will support program outcomes

Potential Bonus Points for New Project: Possible Points 3 Awarded Bonus Points: _____
Sources: Letter of Intent, Project Application

Possible Points	Criteria	Yes	No
1	Project will provide rapid-rehousing for families		
1	Project will serve 100% chronic homeless		
1	Exceeded 175% leverage		

Point Comparison by Section		
Section	Renewal	New
Priority Population	12	11
Project Administration	4	
Project Narrative		7
Budget		2
Projected Outcomes		9
Income Growth	7	
Housing Stability: PSH	6	
Housing Stability: TH	3	
Housing Stability: SSO	2	
Bonus	3	3
TOTAL: PSH	32	
TOTAL: TH	29	
TOTAL: SSO	28	
TOTAL: NEW		32